



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,302	09/14/2006	Toshihiko Shimakawa	5183-0101PUS1	7523

2292 7590 04/30/2009  
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER
----------

HSIEH, PING Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2618

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

04/30/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/539,302	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SHIMAKAWA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> PING Y. HSIEH	<b>Art Unit</b> 2618	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 19 and 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 June 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-21 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1-11 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Westervelt et al. (U.S. PG-PUB NO. 2002/0073196) in view of Grube et al. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,885,874).

-Regarding claims 1, 7, 9 and 10, Westervelt et al. disclose an analyzing system comprising: a collecting unit for collecting a survey result of a pre-designated survey from a terminal device (**server unit 50 preferably enables a system user to receive instructions or messages to individual 20 and enables a system user to view data regarding individual 20 activity, location, or project as disclosed in paragraph 38**), wherein said survey

Art Unit: 2618

includes responses, entered by a user, to a plurality of questions (**individual 20 communicates to system user 200 data 300 comprising detailed worker information 310 and project information 320 as disclosed in fig. 3 and paragraph 43; although the reference does not specifically disclose questions, it would have been obvious that the questions are being communicated**); and an analyzing unit for carrying out a predetermined analysis on the basis of the collected survey result (**individual 20 communicates to system user 200 data 300 comprising detailed worker information 310 and project information 320; data 300 is preferably used by system user 200 for administrative purposes to monitor individual 20 activity; and the formatted data 300 can be seamlessly applied to system user software 230 wherein data 300 is preferably processed into constructive reports for delivery to various administrative departments such as sales and marketing 350 as disclosed in paragraph 43 and 44**). Westervelt et al. further disclose said survey result collected from the terminal device including external environment information of a survey point and said survey (**location verification 314 of data 300 communicated from individual 20 to system user 200 as disclosed in fig. 3 and paragraph 43**). However, Westervelt et al. fail to disclose a determining unit for determining reliability of the survey result on the basis of external environment information at a survey point and said survey added to said survey result by said terminal device; and the predetermined analysis is on the basis of said reliability.

Grube et al. disclose said survey result collected from the terminal device including external environment information of a survey point and said survey **(communication unit 105 includes a location determination element 126 for determining the location of the communication unit 105 as disclosed in fig. 1 and further disclosed in col. 6 lines 33-58)**; and a determining unit for determining reliability **(i.e. inside or outside of the boundary)** of the survey result on the basis of external environment information at a survey point and said survey added to said survey result by said terminal device **(the GLSS controller determines the eligibility of the subscriber unit to participate in the GLSS by applying filtering policy at step 503 as disclosed in fig. 5 and col. 13 lines 10-20).**

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the survey result to include the location information as disclosed by Grube et al. and analyze the result in consideration of the location. One is motivated as such in order to provide a more accurate analysis.

-Regarding claim 2, the combination further discloses said analyzing unit comprises: an extracting part for selecting a survey result to be analyzed on the basis of said reliability **(Westervelt et al., server unit 50 receive an appropriate authorization code and mobile unit 10 identification, such as phone number information, preferably prompts server unit 50 to initiate a program which geographically locate the position of mobile unit 10 and provide**

**geographic position information to a system user at computer terminal 40 as disclosed in paragraph 35); and an analyzing part for carrying out said analysis on the basis of the selected survey result (Westervelt et al., individual 20 communicates to system user 200 data 300 comprising detailed worker information 310 and project information 320; data 300 is preferably used by system user 200 for administrative purposes to monitor individual 20 activity; and the formatted data 300 can be seamlessly applied to system user software 230 wherein data 300 is preferably processed into constructive reports for delivery to various administrative departments such as sales and marketing 350 as disclosed in paragraph 43 and 44).**

-Regarding claim 3, the combination further discloses said external environment information is survey position information specifying the position of said terminal device at the time point when said survey is conducted (**Grube et al., as disclosed in col. 6 lines 33-58**).

-Regarding claim 4, the combination further discloses said survey includes survey target position information specifying a target point of a survey (**Grube et al., as disclosed in col. 6 lines 33-58 and col. 13 lines 10-20**), and said determining unit determines reliability of said survey result on the basis of said survey target position information and said survey position information (**Grube et al., col. 13 lines 10-20**).

-Regarding claim 5, the combination further discloses a plurality of survey results exist for the same survey, said extracting unit selects a survey result of

Art Unit: 2618

high reliability (**Grube et al., filtering policy is used to limit the participation in a location sharing service within certain talk groups only to certain areas enclosed within certain geographic boundaries as disclosed in col. 13 lines 10-20).**

-Regarding claim 6, the combination further discloses a providing unit for transmitting said survey to said terminal device (**Westervelt et al., as disclosed in paragraph 38).**

-Regarding claim 8, Westervelt et al. disclose a survey result collecting system comprising: a collecting unit for collecting a survey result of a pre-designated survey from a terminal device (**server unit 50 preferably enables a system user to receive instructions or messages to individual 20 and enables a system user to view data regarding individual 20 activity, location, or project as disclosed in paragraph 38), wherein said survey includes responses, entered by a user, to a plurality of questions (individual 20 communicates to system user 200 data 300 comprising detailed worker information 310 and project information 320 as disclosed in fig. 3 and paragraph 43); an extracting unit for selecting a survey result (server unit 50 receive an appropriate authorization code and mobile unit 10 identification, such as phone number information, preferably prompts server unit 50 to initiate a program which geographically locate the position of mobile unit 10 and provide geographic position information to a system user at computer terminal 40 as disclosed in paragraph 35); and an output unit for**

outputting the selected survey result **(as disclosed in paragraph 38)**. Westervelt et al. further disclose said survey result collected from the terminal device including external environment information of a survey point and said survey **(location verification 314 of data 300 communicated from individual 20 to system user 200 as disclosed in fig. 3 and paragraph 43)**. However, Westervelt et al. fail to disclose a determining unit for determining reliability of the survey result on the basis of external environment information at a survey point and said survey added to said survey result by said terminal device; and the selecting of survey result is on the basis of said reliability.

Grube et al. disclose said survey result collected from the terminal device including external environment information of a survey point and said survey **(communication unit 105 includes a location determination element 126 for determining the location of the communication unit 105 as disclosed in fig. 1 and further disclosed in col. 6 lines 33-58)**; and a determining unit for determining reliability **(i.e. inside or outside of the boundary)** of the survey result on the basis of external environment information at a survey point and said survey added to said survey result by said terminal device **(the GLSS controller determines the eligibility of the subscriber unit to participate in the GLSS by applying filtering policy at step 503 as disclosed in fig. 5 and col. 13 lines 10-20)**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the survey result to include the location



Art Unit: 2618

information as disclosed by Grube et al. and select the result in consideration of the location. One is motivated as such in order to provide a more accurate analysis.

-Regarding claims 11 and 16, Westervelt et al. disclose an analyzing system comprising: a providing unit for providing a program which is adapted to specification of a terminal device and can be executed in said terminal device to said terminal device via a network (**server unit 50 preferably enables a system user to send/receive instructions or messages to individual 20 and enables a system user to view data regarding individual 30 activity, location, or project as disclosed in fig. 1 and fig. 3 and further disclosed in paragraph 38**); and a collecting unit for collecting a survey result which is obtained by executing said program in said terminal device (**server unit 50 also operate to format inputted/downloaded data from geographic position determination unit 30 for accounting software in a system user's computer terminal 40 as disclosed in paragraph 33 and 38**), and response, entered by a user, to a plurality of questions, said survey result collected from said terminal device via said network (**individual 20 communicates to system user 200 data 300 comprising detailed worker information 310 and project information 320 as disclosed in fig. 3 and paragraph 43**). Westervelt et al. further disclose said survey result collected from the terminal device including external environment information of a survey point and said survey (**location verification 314 of data 300 communicated from individual 20 to system user 200 as disclosed in**

**fig. 3 and paragraph 43)** However, Westervelt et al. fail to disclose location verification is a location determination element.

Grube et al. disclose said survey result collected from the terminal device including external environment information of a survey point and said survey **(communication unit 105 includes a location determination element 126 for determining the location of the communication unit 105 as disclosed in fig. 1 and further disclosed in col. 6 lines 33-58).**

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the survey result to include the location information as disclosed by Grube et al. One is motivated as such in order to provide a more accurate analysis.

-Regarding claim 13, the combination further discloses said collecting unit stores external environment information included in said survey result and an ideal value to be obtained in said survey result so as to be associated with each other **(Westervelt et al., server unit 50 preferably enables a system user to receive instructions or messages to individual 20 and enables a system user to view data regarding individual 20 activity, location, or project as disclosed in paragraph 38).**

-Regarding claim 14, the combination further discloses a determining unit for determining reliability of a survey result on the basis of said external environment information included in said survey result **(Grube et al., the GLSS controller determines the eligibility of the subscriber unit to participate in**

Art Unit: 2618

**the GLSS by applying filtering policy at step 503 as disclosed in fig. 5 and col. 13 lines 10-20); and an analyzing unit for carrying out a predetermined analysis on the basis of a collected survey result in consideration of the reliability of the collected survey result (Westervelt et al., individual 20 communicates to system user 200 data 300 comprising detailed worker information 310 and project information 320; data 300 is preferably used by system user 200 for administrative purposes to monitor individual 20 activity; and the formatted data 300 can be seamlessly applied to system user software 230 wherein data 300 is preferably processed into constructive reports for delivery to various administrative departments such as sales and marketing 350 as disclosed in paragraph 43 and 44).**

-Regarding claim 15, the combination further discloses a survey result storing unit for storing said survey result **(Westervelt et al., server unit 50 provides data storage for information moving through interface 60 as disclosed in paragraph 38); and an extracting unit for selecting a survey result to be analyzed from said survey result storing unit on the basis of said reliability (Westervelt et al., server unit 50 receive an appropriate authorization code and mobile unit 10 identification, such as phone number information, preferably prompts server unit 50 to initiate a program which geographically locate the position of mobile unit 10 and provide geographic position information to a system user at computer terminal 40 as disclosed in paragraph 35), wherein said analyzing unit carries out a**

Art Unit: 2618

predetermined analysis on the basis of the selected survey result (**Westervelt et al., individual 20 communicates to system user 200 data 300 comprising detailed worker information 310 and project information 320; data 300 is preferably used by system user 200 for administrative purposes to monitor individual 20 activity; and the formatted data 300 can be seamlessly applied to system user software 230 wherein data 300 is preferably processed into constructive reports for delivery to various administrative departments such as sales and marketing 350 as disclosed in paragraph 43 and 44).**

-Regarding claim 17, the combination further discloses said collecting unit accepts survey results of a survey until a predetermined time limit which is set for each survey (**Westervelt et al., as disclosed in paragraph 39).**

4. Claims 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Westervelt et al. (U.S. PG-PUB NO. 2002/0073196) in view of Grube et al. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,885,874) and further in view of Pendragon (internet article April 2000, XP002393717).

-Regarding claim 12, Westervelt et al. in combination with Grube et al. discloses all the limitation as claimed in claim 11. The combination further discloses enabling a system user to send/receive instructions or message to individual 20 as disclosed in Westervelt et al., paragraph 38. However, the combination fails to specifically disclose the instructions or message is a survey information file storing unit for storing a plurality of programs prepared for respective surveys, wherein on the basis of specifications of said terminal device,

said providing unit reads a program of a survey corresponding to the specifications from said survey information file storing unit and provides it to said terminal device.

Pendragon discloses a survey information file storing unit for storing a plurality of programs prepared for respective surveys (**Pendragon forms configuration database as disclosed in fig. 1 and further disclosed in paragraphs 1 and 2 in page 3**), wherein on the basis of specifications of said terminal device, said providing unit reads a program of a survey corresponding to the specifications from said survey information file storing unit and provides it to said terminal device (**as disclosed in page 5, paragraph “Distributing Forms to Handhelds**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the instructions of Westervelt et al. and Grube et al. to be replaced with the forms as disclosed by Pendragon. One is motivated as such in order to provide configurations to the survey and improve accuracy.

5. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Westervelt et al. (U.S. PG-PUB NO. 2002/0073196) in view of Grube et al. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,885,874) and further in view of Fuccello et al. (U.S. PATENT NO. 7,092,369).

-Regarding claim 18, Westervelt et al. in combination with Grube et al. discloses all the limitations as claimed in claims 11 and 17. The combination further discloses a log storing unit for managing a survey a surveyor takes

Art Unit: 2618

charge of on a surveyor unit basis (**Westervelt et al., sever unit 50 provides data storage for information moving through navigable interface 60 as disclosed in paragraph 38**). However, the combination fails to specifically disclose a notifying unit for, when the remaining period to said time limit becomes shorter than a predetermined period, sending a notification of urging a surveyor in charge of the survey to transmit a survey result to the surveyor.

Fuccello et al. disclose a notifying unit for, when the remaining period to said time limit becomes shorter than a predetermined period, sending a notification of urging a surveyor in charge of the survey to transmit a survey result to the surveyor (**as disclosed in col. 3 line 66-col. 4 line 2**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the analyzing system of Westervelt et al. and Grube et al. to include the notification unit as disclosed by Fuccello et al. One is motivated as such in order to notify user the shortage of time for completing the survey and prevent loss of survey data.

-Regarding claim 20, the combination further discloses said terminal device presents a survey by executing said program (**Westervelt et al., server unit 50 preferably enables a system user to receive instructions or messages to individual 20 and enables a system user to view data regarding individual 20 activity, location, or project as disclosed in paragraph 38**), said survey result includes position information of said terminal device when said survey is presented (**Westervelt et al., geographic position**

Art Unit: 2618

**determination unit 30 provides geographic location of mobile unit 10 to a system user; and server unit 50 also operate to format inputted/downloaded data from geographic position determination unit 30 for accounting software in a system user's computer terminal 40 as disclosed in paragraph 33 and 38)** and an image captured by said terminal device when said survey is presented **(Fuccello et al., as fig. 5 and fig. 6)**, and said survey result storing unit stores said position information and said image so as to be associated with each other **(Westervelt et al., server unit 50 provides data storage for information moving through interface 60 as disclosed in paragraph 38).**

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 2/2/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. In pages 9-13 of the remarks, regarding claims 1-9 and 11, applicant argues that:

i. Neither Westervelt nor Grube teach or suggest “a collecting unit for collecting a survey result of a pre-designated survey from a terminal device, said survey result collected from the terminal device including external environment information of a survey point and said survey, wherein said survey includes responses, entered by a user, to a plurality of questions”.

Art Unit: 2618

-The examiner respectfully disagrees. The combination indeed discloses a collecting unit for collecting a survey result of a pre-designated survey from a terminal device (**Westervelt, server unit 50 preferably enables a system user to receive instructions or messages to individual 20 and enables a system user to view data regarding individual 20 activity, location, or project as disclosed in paragraph 38; and pre-designated survey (i.e., data 300) as disclosed in fig. 3 and paragraph 43**), said survey result collected from the terminal device including external environment information of a survey point and said survey (**Westervelt, location verification 314 of data 300 communicated from individual 20 to system user 200 as disclosed in fig. 3 and paragraph 43**), wherein said survey includes responses, entered by a user, to a plurality of question (**Westervelt, individual 20 communicates to system user 200 data 300 comprising detailed worker information 310 and project information 320 as disclosed in fig. 3 and paragraph 43; although the reference does not specifically disclose questions, it would have been obvious that the questions are being communicated**).

ii. Grube fails to teach “a determining unit for determining reliability of the survey result on the basis of the external environment information at the survey point and the survey added to the survey result by the terminal device”.



-The examiner respectfully disagrees. The combination indeed discloses a determining unit for determining reliability **(Grube, i.e. inside or outside of the boundary)** of the survey result on the basis of the external environment information at the survey point and the survey added to the survey result by the terminal device **(Westervelt, location verification 314 of data 300 communicated from individual 20 to system user 200 as disclosed in fig. 3 and paragraph 43; Grube, the GLSS controller determines the eligibility of the subscriber unit to participate in the GLSS by applying filtering policy at step 503 as disclosed in fig. 5 and col. 13 lines 10-20).**

iii. Based on the examiner's rejection, it appears that the examiner is relying upon the determined location to teach both the survey and the external environment information of the survey point. However, claim 1 clearly requires two pieces of information, namely 1) external environment information of a survey point; and 2) the survey. Applicants maintain that the examiner's reliance on only the location information is wholly improper. Further, claim 1 requires determining reliability of one piece of information, namely the survey result, based on the second piece of information, namely, the external information at the survey point. However, the examiner appears to be relying on a wholly different teaching to disclosure determining reliability of a survey result. The examiner relies on determining whether the subscriber is inside or outside a boundary. The

Art Unit: 2618

boundary information cannot teach the survey result because the boundary information is not received from the subscriber's terminal device, as required by the claim. The only information relied upon by the examiner is merely the location of the communication unit. In other words, since only one piece of information is being received from the communication unit, namely, the location of the unit, it is improper for the examiner to support his rejection by asserting that the one piece of information is used to determine reliability of the same piece of information. Alternatively, it is improper for the examiner to support his rejection by asserting that one piece of information (location is used to determine reliability of information that is not relied in the survey result from the terminal unit (the boundary information)).

-The examiner respectfully disagrees. The combination indeed discloses 1) external environment information of a survey point (**Westervelt, location verification 314 of data 300 communicated from individual 20 to system user 200 as disclosed in fig. 3 and paragraph 43; Grube, communication unit 105 includes a location determination element 126 for determining the location of the communication unit 105 as disclosed in fig. 1 and further disclosed in col. 6 lines 33-58**); and 2) the survey (**Westervelt, worker information in data 300 as disclosed in fig. 3 and paragraph 43**). The combination further discloses determining reliability of one piece of information, namely the survey result, based on

the second piece of information, namely, the external information at the survey point **(Grube determining inside or outside of boundary based on the location verification 314 of data 300 communicated from individual 20 to system user 200 as disclosed by Westervelt in fig. 3 and paragraph 43 and location determination element 126 for determining the location of the communication unit 105 as disclosed by Grube in fig. 1 and further disclosed in col. 6 lines 33-58).**

- b. In page 13 of the remarks, regarding claim 8, applicant argues that the examiner fails to provide any statement or assertion to support his rejection that Grube teaches that selecting of a survey result is on the basis of the basis of the determine reliability.

-The examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant should consider the combination of references as a whole. The combination indeed discloses selecting of a survey result **(Westervelt, server unit 50 receive an appropriate authorization code and mobile unit 10 identification, such as phone number information, preferably prompts server unit 50 to initiate a program which geographically locate the position of mobile unit 10 and provide geographic position information to a system user at computer terminal 40 as disclosed in paragraph 35) is on the basis of the basis of the determine reliability (i.e. inside or outside of the boundary) (Grube, the GLSS controller determines the eligibility of the subscriber unit to participate in the GLSS by**

**applying filtering policy at step 503 as disclosed in fig. 5 and col. 13 lines 10-20).**

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claims 19 and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PING Y. HSIEH whose telephone number is (571)270-

Art Unit: 2618

3011. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (alternate Fridays) 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lana N. Le can be reached on (571)272-7891. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/P. Y. H./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2618

/Lana N. Le/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614